

### ***Remarks***

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application, with claims 1 and 5 being independent claims.

In the Office Action dated May 9, 2005, claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sakamoto, U.S. Patent No. 6,674,270 in view of Zadeh et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,522,111. Claims 9-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Allowable claims 9-20***

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 9-20.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sakamoto, U.S. Patent No. 6,674,270 in view of Zadeh et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,522,111. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites

a high voltage regulator capable of receiving an external high voltage supply and capable of outputting an intermediate supply voltage; and

a plurality of parallel low voltage regulators capable of receiving the intermediate supply voltage and capable of outputting a regulated output voltage . . .

In other words, claim 1 recites a cascoded arrangement of a high voltage regulator and low voltage regulators. This aspect is not disclosed in Sakamoto. The Office Action refers to element 1 ("main power") in FIG. 1 of Sakamoto as being a high voltage regulator, as recited in the claims. However, "main power," as described at, e.g., col. 4, lines 47-58 of Sakamoto is nothing more than a power supply or line voltage, such as available from a wall outlet. It is not a high voltage regulator.

Furthermore, Sakamoto does not describe a two-stage, or cascoded, arrangement as recited in claim 1--it only describes a single stage arrangement. Further still, nothing in Sakamoto discusses breakdown voltage issues, such as recited

Chen *et al.*  
Appl. No. 10/643,957

in claim 1 (“wherein the intermediate supply voltage is no higher than a breakdown voltage of the low voltage regulators”).

Claim 5 similarly recites a “high voltage regulator; and a plurality of parallel low voltage regulators.” At least this aspect is absent from Sakamoto. The aspect of “wherein the intermediate voltage is no higher than a breakdown voltage of the low voltage regulators,” as recited in claim 5 is absent as well.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections, and an allowance of all the claims.

### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Chen *et al.*  
Appl. No. 10/643,957

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

  
George S. Bardmesser  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,020

Date: June 6, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

404527\_1.doc